1	7.	37.0.0
	Α Α	Yes.

Q And do the colors correspond, the green in your table is the green on this chart, and the yellow in your table is the yellow in this chart?

A Yes.

Q So, Mr. Herman, if you could just tell us what this exhibit in front of you,
Tennis Channel Exhibit 189, tells you?

A Yes, this is, in terms of form, the same format, same process, as the last set of charts.

The total pie represents Versus

top 30 accounts. The dark green part

represents the -- that says the Tennis Channel

is doing business with those accounts that

represented percent of the revenue from

Versus top 30 accounts.

The yellow means the Tennis

Channel made a presentation to or had

conversations with accounts that represented

percent of Versus revenue.

1 So in total, percent of 2 Versus's top 30 -- in total, the revenue from 3 percent of Versus' top 30 accounts, 4 somebody that works for me has been doing 5 business with or is talking to about doing business with. 6 7 MS. POGORILER: Your Honor, I lost 8 track, but if I didn't move this one into 9 evidence, I do now. 10 JUDGE SIPPEL: That's okay. I let 11 this go. We -- this has been marked as Tennis Channel Exhibit 189. Is that correct? 12 13 MS. POGORILER: Yes. 14 JUDGE SIPPEL: And that's the 15 Versus/Tennis Channel advertiser overlap for 2010. It's marked. You're moving it into 16 17 evidence. 18 Any objection? 19 MR. MOSS: Subject to 20 completeness, Your Honor, no objection. 21 JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Received at 22 this time then as Tennis Channel Exhibit 189.

(The document, having been marked previously for identification as Tennis Channel Exhibit No. 189, was received in evidence.)

BY MS. POGORILER:

Q And Mr. Herman, in preparing the data that is a source of this chart, did you include all Versus advertisers and all Tennis Channel advertisers, or did you exclude any?

A No, no. It was the same process as Golf Channel. It was a little more difficult, but we tried to exclude -- since Versus is a multi-sport channel, products or services that were specifically needed for, you know, if there was hockey stick advertising, then we would not have included th money from hockey equipment, as an example.

Q Now, in preparing your written direct testimony, did you look at any other information about the ad overlap between Tennis Channel, Golf Channel, and Versus?

A Yes. I did. I wanted to look at

it from another point of view. I mean, we're, as you know, a relatively new channel, and we probably have a couple hundred of accounts.

Golf Channel has well over 500 accounts, and so does Versus.

So, I wanted to see what it would look like if we took Tennis Channel's top 30 accounts and how many of those accounts purchased advertising on other sports channels, including Golf Channel and Versus, and that's the chart, I believe, in tab C.

Q And what did you conclude from you study of this issue?

A Well, again, it reinforced, which is probably obvious, that from advertisers' point of view, Tennis Channel is a sports channel and competes with other sports channels.

So, this is a list of our top 30 billing accounts, and if you read to the right, you can see the amount of money that those same accounts spent on the other sports

1 channels.

percent of all of Tennis

Channel's top 30 accounts purchased multiple
other sports channels.

percent purchased Golf Channel.

Not the revenue, the actual numbers of accounts, over out of 10 accounts that placed money on Tennis Channel also placed money on Golf Channel.

And percent of the accounts that we do business with of these top 30 also did buys on Versus.

Q Now, in your experience, does

Tennis Channel's level of distribution affect

its ability to sell advertising?

A From my experience, distribution is the single most important factor in our ability to compete and to increase revenues.

And on the flip side, it turns out to be the single most prevalent reason that we get from advertisers for not doing business with us.

Q Now, do you have an understanding as to why that is?

A Yes. I mean, you know, from the advertiser's point of view, they want their commercials to be seen by as many people as possible.

And in the way television works,
the more households a cable channel has -- you
know, I'm simplifying it, but the more
households you have, the more people are going
to see the commercials, and advertisers want
to have more people see the commercials.

The more households you get, the more impressions you have to sell, it changes your rate basis. When your rates go up, then your inventory becomes more valuable, and you can earn higher shares of ad budgets.

It's the fundamental mathematics of how cable works.

MS. POGORILER: Your Honor, just because we're about to get into some specific names which are confidential information, we

Page 594 1 would ask that people who haven't signed a 2 protective order be excused from the room. 3 JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. You know 4 who you are. 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: Someone will try to 6 locate you, when it's appropriate. 7 (Pause.) 8 MS. POGORILER: Thank you, Your 9 Honor. JUDGE SIPPEL: You have to be nice 10 11 to the press, because --12 (Laughter.) -- they like stuff. 13 14 MS. POGORILER: That's good 15 advice. 16 (Laughter.) JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead. 17 BY MS. POGORILER: 18 19 Mr. Herman, can you just give us Q 20 one or two examples of when Tennis Channel's 21 distribution has been an issue for it in 22 selling ads?

A Yeah, sure. I mean, we've been pitching, trying to get business from for years. They're one of the largest, you know, television advertisers.

And consistently, the response is, you guys look great, but you don't have enough distribution, and you don't have national Nielsen ratings.

is an example

we've been talking to for quite a few years. They also agree, because all the syndicated research shows that we're a good fit, and they've said for years, love you guys, you're just not big enough. You don't have enough distribution. We don't think we're going to get enough reach out of buying you.

MR. MOSS: And Your Honor, we'd just like to interpose an objection. I believe Mr. Herman is summarizing paragraphs 16, 17, 18 and 20.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Of his testimony?

MR. MOSS: I'm sorry. Yes, I'm

Page 596 sorry, I think I did that too quickly. 16, 1 2 17, 18, and 20, which consist entirely of 3 hearsay, and I think in some cases, double hearsay. 5 And we just argue, Your Honor, 6 that although we haven't objected to 7 admission, that this evidence isn't entitled 8 to any weight at all. 9 JUDGE SIPPEL: Because of its 10 hearsay nature? 11 MR. MOSS: Yes, Your Honor. 12 MS. POGORILER: Your Honor, we actually have --13 14 MR. MOSS: I'm sorry? 15 MS. POGORILER: We actually have some questions we can ask Mr. Herman to 16

explain -- to address that concern.

JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Because really, the test is more a test of reliability. Hearsay, per se, can be -- doesn't necessarily have to be not believed.

On the other hand, it does raise a concern,

17

18

19

20

21

22

and you've raised it, so let's see if we can
address it.

BY MS. POGORILER:

Q Mr. Herman, have advertisers ever directly expressed to you that Tennis
Channel's distribution or lack of Nielsen ratings is the reason that they would decline to buy ads on Tennis Channel?

A Yes. In the case of

, over the years, I've had multiple salespeople call on that report back to me with the results of their meetings.

I've attended meetings at

, and spoken with the planning groups and the buyers. And I ask them, point-blank, is Tennis Channel's distribution going to stand in the way of you doing business with us?

And the answer was, at this point, you guys are too small. For us to buy you would require some sort of an exception.

1 Part of that conversation, I 2 proffered that, are we too small during our 3 Grand Slam events when we increase our 4 distribution to, you know, homes? 5 And that was taken under consideration. 6 7 And in the case, I was not 8 personally at the meetings, but there were 9 three separate -- my recollection is that there were three separate staff members that 10 11 called on that account that all came back with similar comments about size. 12 13 You know, like I said, this is the 14 most common reason we get, is distribution. MR. MOSS: And Your Honor, we have 15 an objection. I mentioned the double hearsay 16 17 concern before. With respect to , I think 18 Mr. Herman just testified that he wasn't actually even having those conversations with 19 20 21 JUDGE SIPPEL: That's correct.

MR. MOSS: -- that it was his

22

1 sales reps --

2 JUDGE SIPPEL: It was reported

3 back to him.

4 MR. MOSS: Exactly, Your Honor.

5 And those sales reps have not been called to

6 testify.

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

JUDGE SIPPEL: I understand that.

I understand that. No, I understand that. Do you want to address that in any way? I'm not saying that you have to. We can move on, if

11 you're ready.

MS. POGORILER: Yes.

BY MS. POGORILER:

Q Mr. Herman, is it part of your business to understand the ad climate and the concerns expressed by advertisers?

A Yes, it is.

Q And do you regularly rely on reports from your staff about what they're hearing from advertisers?

A I get reports following virtually every sales meeting that's taken place on what

Page 600 1 happened at the sales meeting. I get the 2 reports from my staff. I get the reports from 3 the management that they report into. So --JUDGE SIPPEL: Verbal or oral 4 5 reports? 6 THE WITNESS: Primarily oral 7 reports. 8 JUDGE SIPPEL: Primarily oral? 9 you take notes of those? 10 THE WITNESS: Usually not, unless 11 I have to have some -- unless I have an action 12 that I have to provide, then I'm asking them 13 what was going on. 14 And --15 JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead. Don't --16 go ahead. I'm sorry. 17 THE WITNESS: No, I think this is, 18 I was going to end with, this process is for 19 people that have my position, standard 20 operating procedure. The senior management

can't possibly go on every sales call.

why you have staffs to do that.

21

22

1	MS. POGORILER: I mean, Your
2	Honor, we think that's sufficient to establish
3	the reliability, and I would move on with my
4	questioning.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't have
6	to rule well, you know, I guess I really
7	should say something about the reliability.
8	MR. MOSS: Your Honor, we'd also
9	just make the point that I think Mr. Herman
10	testified that there were documents or notes
11	of these conversations. We haven't received
12	a scrap of paper related to any of these
13	oh, he said he has none. I'm sorry.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, he told me he
15	doesn't take notes, and he said he doesn't get
16	them in writing.
17	MR. MOSS: We haven't received
18	anything. We haven't received anything
19	related to any of these
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: So this is just
21	it's all up here.
22	MR. SCHMIDT: Your Honor, just so

we say it, we've already had a lot of hearsay come in. Given some of the evidence they have said they're going to proffer, I'm frankly surprised at the objection, because I think part of the process here, particularly for someone in Mr. Herman's position, is that the idea that we're going to call every rep and then subpoena the third parties to say, that's in fact what you said, I don't think that's consistent with the processes that have been set up here for an expedited process.

But to the extent that this is an issue, we think it should be -- we can take it up outside of the time of this witness, because what we put in, we have to put in now, and this witness -- I propose that we take this hearsay issue up later.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, he's testifying -- I mean, that's in the record, what he says about that goes in the record. The question is what gets done with it.

And you're right, I don't have to

make an ultimate ruling at this time, but I don't want to let things slip. It is what I'm hearing.

I'm hearing that he's testifying as to what is -- what is -- basically what is standard practice in the industry.

This is how you do things. You've got people in your office, and you send them out to talk to prospective advertisers. I'm sure that goes on to a fair-thee-well, and somehow or other, you've got to get the information back and do something with it.

Well, you don't get it back in writing. You get it back by oral reports.

And then, you know, what do you do with it?

Well, if they're coming in and saying that they'd like to see -- these companies would like to see more coverage, I mean, that really doesn't take it very, very far.

I would assume that everybody -- any -- and this is all assumptions on my part, but this is how I'm seeing it. If you go to

a -- you're trying to buy somebody's -- you've
got to get somebody to buy time so they can
advertise. Isn't that how it works?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

JUDGE SIPPEL: There's going to be a bit of a -- I don't want to say a conflict, but there's two different interests there.

You want to sell the time, and the guy that you're selling it to or the person that you're selling it to, excuse me, may want to bid -- they're going to want to be sure that they're getting the best bang for their buck.

So there's always going to be that tension. Tension's the word, I think, of that -- that the buyer of the time is always going to be concerned about whether or not -- he's being -- you're giving him the scoop on how -- obviously, how many -- what do they call them, eyes, they're reaching ears or eyes, whatever they are.

THE WITNESS: Eyes.

JUDGE SIPPEL: People. And consumers possible. So there's always going to be that tension.

So there's always going to be -- I mean, the information certainly is reliable in the sense of it's explaining how you conduct your business. And I haven't heard anything from anybody -- even an objection or anything that what you do is outside the norm of how business is conducted.

So we'll just take it at that basis. Obviously, the fact that it's not reduced to writing, that this -- is, you know, there's double hearsay that goes on a lot in this world.

Look, I'm accepting really both sides on it. I think this is a legitimate way of presenting the evidence, but I think it's a question of how much weight to give to it, and that's always an arguable point.

Personally, I see nothing right now, listening to this witness, that indicates

- 1 to me that he's trying to puff something up.
- 2 But how would I know, right? That's the
- 3 problem, is how I would know?

objection.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So anyway, I'm going to rule on
this as though there's an objection to this as
hearsay, and I'm going to overrule the

The evidence is coming in as the witness has testified to. He's the witness. He's testified.

He's being cross examined, or he will be cross examined, and let's see how the record looks after the end of the day.

Something like that. Okay? Here we go.

Now, what is your witness order, by the way? This witness is going to be on for how long, you think?

MS. POGORILER: I only have a few more minutes, Your Honor, and then it's --

JUDGE SIPPEL: Cross examine.

Okay. Well, was it the intention of the parties to do more than this witness today?

	Page 607	
1	MR. SCHMIDT: Oh, yes, Your Honor.	
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thanks. Okay.	
3	That's	
4	MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, we're	
5	going to have a busy day.	
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Like as compared to	
7	what, yesterday?	
8	(Laughter.)	
9	All right.	
10	You may proceed. I'm sorry, you	
11	may proceed.	
12	BY MS. POGORILER:	
13	Q Mr. Herman, I think you had an	
14	example in your testimony involving	
15	. Could you tell us about that?	
16	A Yes. We had been trying to get	
17		
18	and we'd been trying to get	
19	on the buy for a long	
20	time.	
21	They had hired	
22		

, to b their spokesperson, and he's all over Tennis Channel air in matches, and we couldn't get to agree to give us the budget.

And their answer was, we're

selling , and you guys aren't big

enough. You're not going to reach enough

households, even with the connection with

and us being Tennis Channel.

For years, we couldn't get that business.

Q Now, did there come a time when did make an ad buy on Tennis Channel?

A Yes, in 2010, my sales rep was persistent. And in 2010, we finally made some headway, and it was during -- and I think that this is an error in my written testimony. It was during the French Open and Wimbledon coverage. I believe my testimony says, the French Open and the US Open, so just for clarity, it was not the US Open.

But here's the point, that they

bought us during our freeview opportunity,
when Tennis Channel's distribution went from
its normal households and then
expanded up.

So during the French Open, we were in households, and during

Wimbledon, we were in households.

So, I don't know, you know, with certainty that the only reason that bought us was because we were in more households.

I'm sure some of it had to do with the fact that, you know, it's tennis, and they wanted to be in the French Open and Wimbledon.

But it's hard for me to imagine
that for all the years that we didn't get any
business from them that the only time we would
is when our distribution increased, and as
soon as the distribution went back to its
normal level, we don't get any buys from them.

Q Mr. Herman, maybe you could just explain what a freeview is?

And Mr. Herman, from now on, if we can leave the names of specific advertisers out.

A Sure.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, is that okay?

Okay, let's get the press back in the room. So, okay, just keep going.

BY MS. POGORILER:

Q I think we were -- just to clarify what a freeview is.

Channel goes to our cable, terrestrial and/or Telco partners and say to them, "You guys can offer this tournament to your customers for no charge. So they don't have to pay us a license fee to show the French Open to all their customers. So that's what a freeview is. And that's how Tennis Channel's distribution for specific times of the year can increase so dramatically.

Q And do you generally notice any difference in ad sales during the freeview

periods?

A Yeah. I mean when I look at the ad sales from -- We do four freeview periods a year which is eight weeks a year. And the total percentage of all the nation sales in those eight weeks represent -- those eight weeks represent 65, you know, 60 percent of our total national sales during the eight weeks of the year that we have expanded distribution. So it's important.

Q And do you know what the reason is for the improved ad sales during freeviews?

A I think more advertisers are comfortable that their commercials are going to be seen by enough people because there is sort of rule of thumb that they want you to be in over 40 million homes. And in both of the French Open -- In all those four cases we are in over 40 million homes.

We generate more impressions.

More people are watching. We get higher rates and we get more revenue.

1 0 Do you rule out that the events 2 that are featured during the freeviews play 3 some role in the improved ad sales? I don't rule it out. 4 No. 5 think the impetus behind the revenue increase 6 is the distribution. And one way we know by 7 the way is that during the U.S. Open when 8 we're in 50 million homes we get higher unit 9 rates and more revenue than when we're in the 10 Australian Open when we're in 40 million 11 homes. Mr. Herman, do you use ratings 12 0 13 when you're pitching advertisers? 14 Α Yeah. We use Nielsen local market 15 ratings. We don't have national ratings. And do you present the ratings to 16 advertisers on a local market basis? 17 18 We get the information on a local Α 19 market basis. And to simplify the process we 20 aggregate the local markets and we submit one

And do advertisers accept that

21

22

number.

Q

methodology?

A Some do. Some don't. The primary advertisers that are national advertisers that we have on the air do accept it. But there's a large, large group of national advertisers that still insist on national rates.

Q And in your experience does Tennis Channel's advertising revenue its ability to grow as a network?

A Yeah. I mean I think I mentioned before we're ad supported. We make money through affiliate sales and through ad sales. That's it. So our ability to expand our facilities to buy more programming rights, to do more original programming, isn't solely determined by ad sales. But we have a significant part in the revenue of the company.

MS. POGORILER: Mr. Herman, I have no further questions right now.

JUDGE SIPPEL: This has got nothing to do with the witness. But I'm going